DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 214 460 HE 014 925

AUTHOR Stewart, Barbara L.
TITLE Employment of Baccalaureate Graduates: The Effect of Institutional Reputation, Location, and Executive Alma Mater.
PUB DATE Aug 79
NOTE 116p.; Ed.D., Brigham Young University.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC05 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Accreditation (Institutions); Bachelors Degrees; *College Graduates; Colleges; *Employer Attitudes; Higher Education; *Job Applicants; *Personnel Selection; *Reputation; School Location; Status

ABSTRACT

The effect of institutional reputation, college and employer location, and employer's alma mater on hiring practices when selecting baccalaureate-level college graduates was studied. Questionnaires were returned by 91 randomly selected companies. While institutional prestige was not a significant factor in employee selection, accreditation was found to be important. Employers felt accreditation yields a degree of assurance of standard quality and subject matter presented, and some indication of student ability to learn and perform. Proximity of school and employer was not a significant employee selection factor, nor was the prestige of the employer's alma mater. A review of the literature revealed little in research and comment relating institutional reputation, proximity of institution and employer, and employer's alma mater to employee selection. The questionnaires and chi square analyses are appended. (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED214460

EMPLOYMENT OF BACCALAUREATE GRADUATES: THE EFFECT OF INSTITUTIONAL REPUTATION, LOCATION, AND EXECUTIVE ALMA MATER

A Dissertation

Presented to the

Department of Secondary and Higher Education and Foundations

Brigham Young University

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Doctor of Education

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Barbara Stewart

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

© Barbara L. Stewart 1979

by

Barbara L. Stewart

August 1979

HE 014 925

AUTHOR ABSTRACT

Dr. Barbara L. Stewart

Director, School of Home Economics, University of Southwestern Louisiana, Lafayette, Louisiana

Ed.D. Brigham Young University, 1979

M.S. Utah State University, 1974

B.A. Brigham Young University, 1973

Born: June 9, 1951; Orange, California

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter		Page
1.	INTRODUCTION	1
	Statement of the Problem	1
	Statement of the Purpose	2
	Justification	2
	Hypotheses	2
	Delimitations	4
	Definitions	4
	Methodology	5
	Organization of the Remainder of the Dissertation	7
	Brief Summary	7
2.	REVIEW OF LITERATURE	9
	Institutional Quality	9
	Prestige	11
	Accreditation	15
	Summary of the Review of Literature	21
3.	FINDINGS	23
	Hypothesis 1a	24
	Hypothesis 1b	29
	Hypothesis 1c	34
	Hypothesis 2a	38

Chapter Page

Hypothesis 2b 39

Hypothesis 2c 40

Summary of the Findings 41

4. SUMMARY OF THE FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS 42

Summary of the Findings 43

Conclusions 44

Recommendations 47

Impressions of the Investigator 48

BIBLIOGRAPHY 49

APPENDIXES 52

A. QUESTIONNAIRE 53

B. QUESTIONNAIRE WITH RESPONSE FREQUENCY NOTATIONS 56

C. QUESTIONNAIRE PART II: QUESTIONS 5, 6, AND 7 WITH t TEST CONFIDENCE INTERVAL AND PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSE NOTATIONS 60

D. QUESTIONNAIRE PART III: QUESTION 13 WITH t TEST CONFIDENCE INTERVAL AND PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSE NOTATIONS 62

E. CHI SQUARE ANALYSIS OF SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES IN OBSERVED AND EXPECTED RESPONSE FREQUENCIES DEALING WITH APPLICANT RANK AND ALMA MATER ACCREDITATION, AND RELATIVE IMPORTANCE OF INSTITUTIONAL ACCREDITATION FROM QUESTIONNAIRE QUESTIONS 3 AND 13 64

F. CHI SQUARE ANALYSIS OF SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES IN OBSERVED AND EXPECTED RESPONSE FREQUENCIES DEALING WITH APPLICANT RANK AND ALMA MATER ACCREDITATION, AND PERCEIVED PRESTIGE OF PERSONNEL OFFICER BACCALAUREATE ALMA MATER FROM QUESTIONNAIRE QUESTIONS 4 AND 12 66

Page

G. CHI SQUARE ANALYSIS OF SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES IN OBSERVED AND EXPECTED RESPONSE FREQUENCIES DEALING WITH APPLICANT RANK AND ALMA MATER ACCREDITATION, AND PERCEIVED PRESTIGE OF CORPORATE PRESIDENT DOCTORAL ALMA MATER FROM QUESTIONNAIRE QUESTIONS 4 AND 12 . . 68

H. CHI SQUARE ANALYSIS OF SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES IN OBSERVED AND EXPECTED RESPONSE FREQUENCIES DEALING WITH APPLICANT RANK AND ALMA MATER ACCREDITATION, AND RELATIVE IMPORTANCE OF INSTITUTIONAL ACCREDITATION FROM QUESTIONNAIRE QUESTIONS 4 AND 13 70

I. CHI SQUARE ANALYSIS OF SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES IN OBSERVED AND EXPECTED RESPONSE FREQUENCIES DEALING WITH APPLICANT ALMA MATER PRESTIGE AND RELATIVE IMPORTANCE OF INSTITUTIONAL PRESTIGE FROM QUESTIONNAIRE QUESTIONS 5 AND 13 72

J. CHI SQUARE ANALYSIS OF SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES IN OBSERVED AND EXPECTED RESPONSE FREQUENCIES DEALING WITH APPLICANT ALMA MATER ACCREDITATION AND RELATIVE IMPORTANCE OF INSTITUTIONAL ACCREDITATION FROM QUESTIONS 6 AND 13 . . 74

K. CHI SQUARE ANALYSIS OF SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES IN OBSERVED AND EXPECTED RESPONSE FREQUENCIES DEALING WITH APPLICANT ALMA MATER LOCATION AND RELATIVE IMPORTANCE OF INSTITUTIONAL LOCATION FROM QUESTIONS 7 AND 13 76

L. CHI SQUARE ANALYSIS OF SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES IN OBSERVED AND EXPECTED RESPONSE FREQUENCIES DEALING WITH APPLICANT ALMA MATER LOCATION AND RELATIVE IMPORTANCE OF INSTITUTIONAL PRESTIGE FROM QUESTIONS 7 AND 13 78

Page

M. CHI SQUARE ANALYSIS OF SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES IN OBSERVED AND EXPECTED RESPONSE FREQUENCIES DEALING WITH APPLICANT ALMA MATER LOCATION AND PRESTIGE, AND RELATIVE IMPORTANCE OF INSTITUTIONAL PRESTIGE FROM QUESTIONS 8 AND 13 80

N. CHI SQUARE ANALYSIS OF SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES IN OBSERVED AND EXPECTED RESPONSE FREQUENCIES DEALING WITH APPLICANT ALMA MATER LOCATION AND PRESTIGE, AND RELATIVE IMPORTANCE OF INSTITUTIONAL ACCREDITATION FROM QUESTIONS 9 and 13 82

O. CHI SQUARE ANALYSIS OF SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES IN OBSERVED AND EXPECTED RESPONSE FREQUENCIES DEALING WITH APPLICANT ALMA MATER LOCATION AND PRESTIGE, AND RELATIVE IMPORTANCE OF INSTITUTIONAL PRESTIGE FROM QUESTIONS 9 AND 13 84

P. CHI SQUARE ANALYSIS OF SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES IN OBSERVED AND EXPECTED RESPONSE FREQUENCIES DEALING WITH APPLICANT ALMA MATER LOCATION AND PRESTIGE, AND RELATIVE IMPORTANCE OF INSTITUTIONAL LOCATION FROM QUESTIONS 9 AND 13 86

Q. CHI SQUARE ANALYSIS OF SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES IN OBSERVED AND EXPECTED RESPONSE FREQUENCIES DEALING WITH APPLICANT ALMA MATER LOCATION AND ACCREDITATION, AND RELATIVE IMPORTANCE OF INSTITUTIONAL ACCREDITATION FROM QUESTIONS 10 AND 13 88

R. CHI SQUARE ANALYSIS OF SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES IN OBSERVED AND EXPECTED RESPONSE FREQUENCIES DEALING WITH APPLICANT ALMA MATER LOCATION AND ACCREDITATION, AND RELATIVE IMPORTANCE OF INSTITUTIONAL ACCREDITATION FROM QUESTIONS 11 AND 13 90

Page

S. CHI SQUARE ANALYSIS OF SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES IN OBSERVED AND EXPECTED RESPONSE FREQUENCIES DEALING WITH APPLICANT ALMA MATER LOCATION AND ACCREDITATION, AND RELATIVE IMPORTANCE OF INSTITUTIONAL LOCATION FROM QUESTIONS 11 AND 13 92

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

A wide variety of colleges and universities of varying academic quality exist throughout the United States. When faced with the selection of an institution, students are often concerned with the perception of those varying schools held by potential employers.

To confront the problem of relative quality of institutions, several accrediting and rating organizations have been established. The question remains, however, whether potential employers are aware of the prestige or accreditation status of schools and whether they utilize institutional reputation as a variable in their employee selection.

Statement of the Problem

The problem underlying this study was how to counsel students in their choice of colleges and universities. Information was desired about relationships between institutional prestige, accreditation, and location and the effect these variables may have on post-graduate employment opportunities.

Statement of the Purpose

The purpose of this study was to determine whether there is a significant difference in employee selection based on institutional reputation as determined by prestige and accreditation, relative location of employer and institution, and the alma mater of the corporate president and personnel officer.

Justification

The resolution of this problem can provide information concerning the effect of prestige or accreditation status of the degree granting institution in the hiring procedure and employment market for graduates. As students select a school at which to pursue a degree, they should be aware of any effect the prestige or accreditation status of that choice may have on later employment prospects. This study can further aid students by providing information on the role of executive alma mater and proximity of institution and potential employer in hiring procedures.

Hypotheses

The objective of this study was to gather and examine data pertaining to the two sets of null hypotheses formulated. These hypotheses were:

1a. No significant difference exists in employee selection based on the prestige of the baccalaureate degree granting institution of applicants.

1b. No significant difference exists in employee selection based on the accreditation status of the baccalaureate degree granting institution of applicants.

1c. No significant difference exists in employee selection based on relative location of the employer and institution.

2a. No significant difference exists between an employer (personnel officer or corporate president) from a prestigious alma mater and an employer from a non-prestigious alma mater in employee selection based on the prestige of the baccalaureate degree granting institution of applicants.

2b. No significant difference exists between an employer (personnel officer or corporate president) from a prestigious alma mater and an employer from a non-prestigious alma mater in employee selection based on the accreditation status of the baccalaureate degree granting institution of applicants.

2c. No significant difference exists between an employer (personnel officer or corporate president) from a prestigious alma mater and an employer from a non-prestigious alma mater in employee selection based on relative location of the employer and institution.

Delimitations

The following limitations were set for this study:

1. Although numerous factors influence employee selection, no attempt has been made within the scope of this project to consider variables other than the prestige and accreditation status of the institution from which a student receives a degree, the location of the institution with respect to the employer, and the degree granting institution of the corporate president and personnel officer.

2. The entire number of potential employers was not considered in this project. A random sample of employers listed in the College Placement Annual[1] was surveyed.

3. This study has been limited to applicants with baccalaureate degrees.

4. The survey of employers was conducted during the fall 1978.

Definitions

The following definitions were utilized for this study:

---

[1]College Placement Annual (Bethlehem, Pa.: The College Placement Council, Inc., 1978).

Accredited institution - an institution accredited by an association recognized by the Council on Postsecondary Accreditation.

Executive alma mater - the degree granting institution of the corporate president or personnel officer.

Institutional reputation - the status afforded an institution based on prestige and accreditation.

Institutions within the locality of the employer - institutions geographically within one hundred miles of the employer's main headquarters.

Prestigious institution - a college or university generally recognized by respondents as having high professional status.

Methodology

The methods involved in the design of this research included seven major steps:

1. Study was undertaken to examine any previous research and comment on the effect of institutional reputation, location, and executive alma mater on employment practices.

2. Two sets of null hypotheses were developed concerning institutional reputation and location, and executive alma mater in employment practices.

3. A questionnaire was prepared to survey the effect of institutional reputation, location, and executive alma mater on employee selection.

4. The questionnaire was distributed to the personnel officers of two hundred randomly selected companies listed in the College Placement Annual[2] as potential employers of baccalaureate graduates.

5. A second wave of questionnaires was mailed to the remaining personnel officers who had neglected to return the original questionnaire by the response deadline.

6. Study of the data included a bivariate range t test at the .95 level of confidence for those questionnaire questions which dealt most directly with the stated hypotheses without confounding of variables, a frequency distribution, and a chi square analysis at the .95 and .99 levels of confidence for all questionnaire responses.

7. Conclusions and recommendations were made based on the findings.

---

[2]College Placement Annual.

Organization of the Remainder of the Dissertation

Following the introductory chapter, Chapter 2, or the review of literature, contains background resources pertinent to this study. Chapter 3 includes the findings of this research, while Chapter 4 is comprised of analysis of the findings and statement of conclusions and recommendations.

Brief Summary

This study examined institutional reputation, location, and corporate executive alma mater as variables in the selection of employees. To achieve this, two sets of null hypotheses stating that no significant differences exist in employee selection based on the prestige, accreditation, and location of the baccalaureate degree granting institution of applicants and no significant difference exists between an employer (personnel officer or corporate president) from a prestigious alma mater and an employer from a non-prestigious alma mater in employee selection based on the prestige, accreditation, and location of the baccalaureate degree granting institution of applicants.

A questionnaire was developed and distributed to potential employers to survey institutional preferences

and the effect of location and executive alma mater on hiring practices. Statistical methods were utilized to analyze the data from which conclusions and recommendations were made.

Chapter 2

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

A review of the literature failed to locate previous, pertinent research on the effects of institutional reputation, proximity of institution and employer, and executive alma mater on the hiring of baccalaureate degree graduates. However, a few studies did relate institutional prestige to predicting job success. Thus, to provide background for this study, included here are related findings on the relationship between institutional quality or prestige and predicted employee success, and the nature and function of accreditation. This review was divided into three categories: institutional quality, prestige, and accreditation.

Institutional Quality

The literature reflected differing opinions regarding institutional quality as a predictor of employee success. It appeared that the diversity results from the elusive nature of quality. Cartter stated:

> Quality is an elusive attribute, not easily subjected to measurement. No single index . . . not any combination of measures is sufficient to

estimate adequately the true worth of an educational institution.[1]

Astin in Who Goes Where to College saw the quality of an institution for an individual student as being based on two different kinds of consequences of attending that institution.

> The first kind of outcome concerns the effects of the college on the student's personal and intellectual development. . . . The second kind of consequence might be referred to as the "fringe benefits" of attending a given college. . . . In short, an undergraduate degree from one institution may, in terms of later educational or vocational opportunities, constitute a somewhat better entree than the same degree from another institution, regardless of the candidate's real talent or potential and regardless of what he has actually learned or what skills he has actually acquired in college.[2]

A study conducted in the early 1960's by the American Telephone and Telegraph Company partially supported Astin's stance in that college quality was positively related to high salary.

> We found that college quality does make a difference. For instance, 55 percent of the men who ranked in the top third in the "above average" group of colleges were in our top salary third, and 31 percent in the lowest academic third made the top salary third. . . . In short, while a relationship

---

[1]Allan M. Cartter, An Assessment of Quality in Graduate Education (Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1966), p. 4.

[2]Alexander W. Astin, Who Goes Where to College (Chicago, Ill.: Science Research Associates, Inc., 1965), pp. 87-88.

> does exist between college quality and salary, rank in class is more significant.[3]

In an attempt to discover how employers view the relative importance of academic experiences, work experience and skills, and personal characteristics, Warner found that work experience and skill factors were most important, followed by personal characteristics. Academic experiences were least important.[4]

Prestige

The task of determining institutional prestige and its effect on selection and success is similarly difficult. Vincent and Olson listed aspects of prestige, social respectability, and the elite among their criteria for institutional quality.[5]

> There are people who judge schools in terms of their social respectability. Such persons employ a sort of criterion of exclusiveness. Loyalty to class or group transcends consideration of what is taught and how it is taught. . . .
> Many schools and colleges, particularly in the East, find themselves ranged on a scale of desirability based almost entirely on this criterion.

---

[3]William S. Vincent and Martin N. Olson, Measurement of School Quality and Its Determiners (Walden, N.Y.: Walden Printing Company, 1972), p. 8.

[4]Wesley E. Warner, "An Analysis of Hiring Criteria Used by Selected Employers in Evaluating Job Candidates Holding Bachelor Degrees," Dissertation Abstracts International, 36 (November 1975), 2679-2680A.

[5]Vincent and Olson, p. 5.

> There is the criterion of the elite, which is related to that of exclusiveness except that the emphasis, instead of being upon family and social position, is upon brains.[6]

Perhaps a more valid understanding of the term "prestige" can be obtained by considering its origins in the Latin verb praestringere as generally used in the phrase prastringere oculos which means "to bind or dazzle the eyes."[7] The term later acquired a more honorable position as reflected in the Oxford English dictionary definition: "Influence or reputation derived from previous character, achievements or associations; or especially from past success."[8]

Nicolson, in a lecture at Cambridge, defined prestige as "power based upon reputation rather than reputation based upon power."[9] Reflecting upon his definition he then posed and answered the following question which may well bear upon the consideration of institutional prestige as a factor in employee selection: "Is it possible today for power based upon reputation to maintain itself against reputation based

---

[6]Vincent and Olson, p. 5.

[7]Harold Nicolson, The Meaning of Prestige (London: Cambridge University Press, 1937), p. 7.

[8]Nicolson, p. 8.

[9]Nicolson, p. 9.

on power? And my answer to that question will be: 'It is not possible.'"[10]

In an address exploring prestige and reputation as means of institutional evaluation, Warner stated:

> There are other methods of external "evaluation" that have some important functions. One example is the prestige or reputation system that informally develops a rank order of the quality of institutions.[11]

In a 1957 study conducted by Hughes Aircraft Company, the rate of salary growth of engineers was found not to be related to the "prestige level" of the employee's alma maters.[12] Evaluating the Hughes' report along with the American Telephone and Telegraph findings and two other partially related studies, Martin, in an article considering employment predictors, stated:

> An approximate consensus of the four studies mentioned would indicate that possibly twice as many graduates with the optimum combination - high grades, prestigious schools, and extra curricular achievement - will attain financial success as those with the minimal combination. What a tragic waste of talent would occur if the so-called minimals were blindly rejected.[13]

---

[10]Nicolson, p. 9.

[11]W. Keith Warner, "Accreditation and Other Forms of External Evaluation," Western College Association Address and Proceedings (Oakland: Western College Association, 1973), p. 50.

[12]Martin, Robert A. "The Inviolate, but Invalid, Employment Predictors," Personnel Journal, 47 January 1968), 20-22.

[13]Martin, p. 21.

Martin further cited an unknown internal relations expert who spoke in defense of "quality" schools as employment success predictors.[14] The consensus was that while such indicators were nowhere near being inviolate, the "odds" would be in favor of those who used such criteria in the screening process.[15]

Prestige has, however, popularly been relied upon as a success indicator as reflected in Cartter's statements:

> It has frequently been noted that the poorest graduates of some selective colleges are better educated than the best students at some mediocre institutions. The typical baccalaureate winner at a few of the more prestigious liberal arts colleges is superior to the master's degree holder of some of the poorer universities.
>
> Our present system works fairly well because most students, parents, and prospective employers know that a bachelor's degree from Harvard, Stanford, Swarthmore, or Reed is ordinarily a better indication of ability and accomplishment than a bachelor's degree from Melrose A & M or Siwash College. Even if no formal studies were ever undertaken, there is always the grapevine at work to supply impressionistic evaluations.[16]

Thus, for some, institutional prestige is an indicator of success.

---

[14]Martin, p. 21.

[15]Martin, p. 21.

[16]Cartter, p. 3.

Accreditation

Another facet of institutional quality or reputation is accreditation. No studies were found relating accreditation to hiring practices. As defined by the Council on Postsecondary Accreditation:

> Accreditation is a process of recognizing educational institutions *in toto* and various professional programs they offer *in parte* for performance, integrity, and quality which entitle them to the confidence of the educational community and the public.[17]

From this definition it can be seen there are basically two types of accreditation: institutional accreditation which deals only with total institutions, and specialized accreditation of professional schools and programs within institutions.[18]

Historically, educational accreditation began in the nineteenth century with the establishment of six regional associations of colleges and secondary schools. Their goal was to evaluate the level and content of instruction by defining the term "college" and establishing entrance requirements. Actual accrediting

---

[17]Sherry S. Harris, ed., Accredited Institutions of Postsecondary Education Programs and Candidates, A Directory of Accredited Institutions, Professionally Accredited Programs, and Candidates for Accreditation (Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1977), p. vii.

[18]Harris, p. vii.

began in the early half of the twentieth century, first with largely objective standards and later on more subjective grounds aimed at judging whether an institution was achieving its own goals. Professional accreditation was initiated by the American Medical Association in 1905 and followed closely state professional licensing. In 1949, two organizations, The Federation of Regional Accrediting Commissions of Higher Education and the National Commission of Accrediting, were formed.[19] In 1975 the Council on Postsecondary Accreditation emerged to replace the two earlier organizations.[20]

According to the Council on Postsecondary Accreditations, accreditation seeks to:

> Foster excellence and postsecondary education through the development of criteria and guidelines for assessing educational effectiveness; encourage improvement through continuous self study and planning; assure the educational community, the general public, and other agencies or organizations that an institution or program has both clearly defined and appropriate objectives, maintains conditions under which their achievement can reasonably be expected, appears in fact to be accomplishing them substantially, and can be expected to continue to do so; provide counsel and assistance to established and developing institutions and programs; and endeavor to protect institutions

---

[19]Kenneth E. Young, "COPA: A New Force on the National Scene," North Central Association Quarterly, 52(3) (Winter 1978), p. 359.

[20]Harold Orlans, Private Accreditation and Public Eligibility (Lexington, Mass.: D. C. Heath and Company, 1975), p. 1.

against encroachments which might jeopardize their educational effectiveness or academic freedom.[21]

In the United States these goals are largely achieved by voluntary institutional or professional associations responsible for establishing criteria, visiting and evaluating institutions at their request, and approving institutions and programs which meet their criteria.[22] Typically, the accreditation process involves: first, a self study to assess institutional effectiveness in light of stated purposes and objectives; second, a visit by a team to evaluate the institution's ability to assess themselves, to make judgments, and then to report; third, a review and comment on the report by the institution or program; and fourth, consideration of the evidence and appropriate action by the accrediting body.[23]

The beneficiaries of accreditation have been felt to extend beyond the academic community as reflected by the inclusion at the Conference on Consumer Protection in Postsecondary Education in 1974 of the major issue: "Are there consumers of postsecondary education services besides students, such as employers and the public at

---

[21]Harris, p. viii.

[22]Harris, p. vii.

[23]Harris, p. vii.

large?"[24] As if answering such a question, Anderson suggested,

> From the beginning of the accrediting movement near the turn of the century, but particularly of late, there have been many users of accreditation within and outside the academic community.[25]

Specifically, Millard began categorizing the many publics of accreditation. Pertinent to this study is his inclusion of "business and industry groups for whom graduation from accredited institutions or programs is a condition for admission or employability."[26]

In support of consideration of the role of accreditation beyond the campus community, Young asserted:

> Public as well as educational needs must be served simultaneously in determining and fostering standards of quality and integrity in the institutions and such specialized programs as they offer. Accreditation, conducted through non governmental institutional and specialized agencies, provides a major means for meeting these needs.[27]

---

[24]The Report of the National Invitational Conference on Consumer Protection in Postsecondary Education (Denver: Education Commission of the States, 1974), p. 2.

[25]W. Keith Warner, Accreditation Influences on Senior Institutions of Higher Education in the Western Accrediting Region: An Assessment (Oakland: Western College Association and Senior Commission of the Western Association of Schools and Colleges, 1977), p. iii.

[26]Warner, 1977, p. iii.

[27]Young, p. 362.

Warner further explained the interaction between the public and accreditation by suggesting,

> It provides some basis for checking the credibility of the image the institution presents to the public at large, to supporting groups, or to consumers of the services provided.[28]

Although Orlans boldly suggested, "One idea underlies all accrediting: the status of being accredited is good,"[29] it appeared unsafe to view accreditation as an assurance of institutional quality. Orlans later explained,

> The common belief that regional accreditation is an assurance of institutional quality or even excellence cannot be sustained. Most unaccredited higher educational institutions have historically been ineligible for accreditation; many are junior colleges, vocational, specialized, sectarian, new, or simply small institutions.
>
> Regional accreditation does, however, attest that an institution is not a degree mill.[30]

Orlans concluded,

> Many good and useful schools remain unaccredited and, conversely, many accredited schools offer poor and useless education. It is the accredited correspondence, business, and trade schools that have posed the greatest problems in the federally insured student loan program, exploiting gullible students by misrepresenting their training and the likelihood that graduates will receive jobs. Unfortunately, accreditation provides no assurance of a school's quality or probity.[31]

---

[28]Warner, 1973, p. 49.

[29]Orlans, p. 1.

[30]Orlans, p. 149.

[31]Orlans, p. 149.

Apparently sufficient comparison of accredited and unaccredited institutions has not been done to merit a true picture of the reliability of accreditation as an indicator of institutional quality. One study undertaken by Smith for the Carnegie Commission of Higher Education showed "few marked differences between accredited and unaccredited schools."[32] Another study, by McKinney, found that in terms of behavioral characteristics, graduates of accredited schools were not significantly different from graduates of unaccredited institutions.[33]

Perhaps some of the uncertainty expressed about the value of accreditation can be traced to an often expressed need for reform as typified by the comments of Kirkwood and Warner.

> I have worked with 200 institutions and traveled 150,000 miles for a regional accrediting commission. In my experience no more than one-third of the self studies and team visits proved under present conditions to be noticeably helpful to the institutions involved.[34]

It is easy to see in the abstract that current accreditation procedures need improvement. The

---

[32]Orlans, p. 176.

[33]Reid Laurence McKinney, "A Study of the Relationship Between the Accreditation Status of Institutions and the Behavior of Their Products," Comprehensive Dissertation Index, 23(10), pp. 3731-3732.

[34]H. R. Kells, "The Reform of Regional Accreditation Agencies," Educational Record, 57 (Winter 1976), p. 25.

> challenge of nontraditional programs, "innovative colleges," external degrees, and the like, have demonstrated in a striking way the shortcomings of traditional evaluation procedures in accreditation.[35]

Reform, therefore, may add to the value of accreditation.

Summary of the Review of Literature

A review of the literature revealed little in research and comment relating institutional reputation, proximity of institution and employer, and executive alma mater to employee selection.

From what information is available, differences were seen in opinions of the reliability of institutional prestige and accreditation as indicators of employee success. Institutional quality was cited as a "fringe benefit" which could result in increased educational or vocational opportunities. Quality was also linked with salary advancement. Similarly, prestige was seen as a factor which could increase financial success.

Accreditation was defined as a process intended to evaluate and insure educational quality. The means of achievement of that goal was explained and the beneficiaries of accreditation beyond the academic community were considered. Specifically listed were business and industry groups.

---

[35]Warner, 1973, p. 49.

The literature reflected that although many writers felt that accreditation was a valid indicator of institutional quality, sufficient comparison of accredited and unaccredited institutions had not been done to reveal a true picture.

Chapter 3

FINDINGS

The purpose of this study was to determine whether there is a significant difference in employee selection based on institutional prestige or accreditation, relative location of employer and institution, and the alma mater of the corporate president and personnel officer. A questionnaire was developed and mailed to two hundred randomly selected companies listed in the College Placement Annual[1] as potential employers of baccalaureate graduates. The ninety-one surveys (45.5 percent) which were returned were analyzed by a bivariate range t test, frequency distribution, and chi square analysis. Because of the compounding of variables, the bivariate range t test was applied only to questions 5, 6, 7, and 13 of the questionnaire since they related most directly to the stated hypotheses.

This study is based on two sets of null hypotheses. Both hypotheses 1 and 2 are subdivided into three parts, a, b, and c. These hypotheses stated: (1) No

---

[1]College Placement Annual (Bethlehem, Pa.: The College Placement Council, Inc., 1978).

significant difference exists in employee selection based on (a) the prestige of the baccalaureate degree granting institution of applicants, (b) the accreditation status of the baccalaureate degree granting institution of applicants, and (c) relative location of employer and institution. (2) No significant difference exists between an employer (personnel officer or corporate president) from a prestigious alma mater and an employer from a non-prestigious alma mater in employee selection based on (a) the prestige of the baccalaureate degree granting institution of applicants, (b) the accreditation status of the baccalaureate degree granting institution of applicants, and (c) relative location of the employer and institution. Therefore, the report of the findings will be divided into categories which correspond to each of the hypotheses. Within the report of data pertinent to each of the hypotheses, results of the bivariate t test will be given first since those results relate most directly to the hypotheses. They will be followed by reports of the frequency distribution and the chi square analysis.

Hypothesis 1a

The first hypothesis stated that no significant difference exists in employee selection based on the

prestige of the baccalaureate degree granting institution of applicants. Question 5 dealt directly with that issue. A range t test showed no significant difference between the 58.2 percent of the responses which selected the graduate of a prestigious institution and the 38.5 percent for whom prestige made no difference (Appendix C). Similarly, the t test showed no significance for the responses to question 13 in which 13.8 percent viewed prestige as most important, 47.1 percent as moderately important, and 38.6 percent as least important (Appendix D).

Study of the frequency of responses to questions dealing with prestige showed the following information (Appendix B). In question 1, 86.8 percent of the personnel officers responding were most likely to hire the first ranking graduate of a prestigious institution. None were likely to hire the second ranking graduate of a non-prestigious institution. For 13.2 percent it made no difference. In question 2, 80 percent appeared to view rank as more important than prestige by selecting the first ranking graduate of a non-prestigious institution. Only 3.3 percent chose the second ranking graduate of a prestigious institution. For 16.7 percent it made no difference. The graduate of a prestigious institution was likely to be hired by 58.2 percent of respondents to question 5, while only 3.3 percent

selected the graduate of a non-prestigious institution. For 38.5 percent, however, prestige made no difference. Slightly more than 75 percent of the personnel officers in question 8 more highly valued the applicant from a local, prestigious institution. None selected the graduate of a non-local, non-prestigious institution, and for 24.2 percent it made no difference. In question 9, 22.2 percent preferred the candidate from a local, non-prestigious institution while 36.7 percent selected the applicant from a non-local, prestigious institution. However, 41.4 percent saw location and prestige as making no difference. Responding to question 13, 13.8 percent of the personnel officers felt prestige was most important in hiring an employee, 47.1 percent felt it was moderately important, and 39.9 percent felt it was least important.

Chi square analysis revealed significant differences between the expected and observed frequencies of responses for several pairs of questionnaire questions dealing with prestige. At the .95 confidence level, responses dealing with perceived prestige of personnel officer's baccalaureate alma mater and hiring a graduate of an accredited institution (questions 4 and 12); perceived prestige of corporate president's doctoral alma mater and hiring a graduate of an accredited

institution (questions 4 and 12); the importance of prestige and hiring a graduate of a local institution (questions 7 and 13); the importance of prestige and hiring a graduate of a local, prestigious institution (questions 8 and 13); and the importance of accreditation and hiring a graduate of a local or prestigious institution (questions 9 and 13) were found to be significant (Appendixes F, G, L, M, and N).

At the .99 level of confidence, significance was noted for the importance of prestige and employment of a graduate of a prestigious institution (questions 5 and 13); the importance of prestige and hiring a graduate of a local or prestigious institution (questions 9 and 13); and the importance of location and hiring a graduate of a local or prestigious institution (questions 9 and 13) (Appendixes I, O, and P).

Based on the findings reported here, hypothesis 1a, that no significant difference exists in employee selection based on the prestige of the baccalaureate degree granting institution of the applicant, was retained. The rationale for this retention can be seen by analyzing each of the responses reported thus far.

In question 5 the t test showed no significance between the number of employers preferring the graduate of a prestigious institution (58.2 percent) and the number of employers for whom it made no difference

(38.5 percent). This indicated that prestige was not a primary variable in hiring. Also, in question 13 no significance was found for the importance of prestige.

Similarly, frequency analysis showed that although the large number (86.8 percent) of respondents selecting the high ranking graduate of a prestigious institution in question 1 may reflect an interest in prestige, it is highly likely that the response frequencies are greatly affected by the applicant's rank. Question 2 supported this idea since a large majority (80 percent) selected rank over prestige. In addition, responses to question 5, although mostly (58.2 percent) in favor of the graduate of a prestigious institution, also expressed a large number (38.5 percent) of cases in which prestige made no difference.

Little valid information can be gained from question 8 since no differentiation was made between location and prestige. Although that was done in question 9, the very large number (41.1 percent) of respondents for whom it made no difference plays down the value (36.7 percent) of respondents selecting prestige rather than proximity.

Further support for the retention of hypothesis 1a came from question 13 in which only 13.8 percent listed prestige as most important in hiring an employee,

47.1 percent as moderately important, and 39.9 percent as least important.

In most cases the chi square analyses had no direct bearing upon hypothesis 1a. In the two cases dealing with questions 8 and 13, and 9 and 13, the significant differences which occurred between expected and observed response frequencies cannot be attributed entirely to prestige since location was a factor in both questions 8 and 9. Therefore, since the data did not support the rejection of hypothesis 1a, it was retained.

Hypothesis 1b

Hypothesis 1b stated that no significant difference exists in employee selection based on the accreditation status of the baccalaureate degree granting institution of applicants. The hypothesis was rejected. Analysis of the range t test showed that the 92.3 percent of the personnel officers who selected the graduate from an accredited institution was significantly greater at the .95 level of confidence than the 7.7 percent of the respondents for whom accreditation made no difference (Appendix C). Also, in question 13 at the .95 level of confidence, the number (80.7 percent) of personnel officers who listed accreditation as most important was statistically significant (Appendix D).

Looking at the frequency distributions (Appendix B), six questions dealt with institutional accreditation as a factor in hiring. In question 3, 95.6 percent of the respondents preferred a first ranking graduate from an accredited institution and 4.4 percent saw rank and accreditation as making no difference. Answers to question 4 were 71.1 percent in support of the second ranking candidate from an accredited institution. The first ranked graduate of an unaccredited institution was selected in 16.7 percent of the cases, and for 12.2 percent it made no difference. Responses to question 6 were highly supportive of accreditation as 92.3 percent of the personnel officers selected the candidate from an accredited institution. Only 7.7 percent felt it made no difference. Question 10 recorded 90.1 percent of the answers favoring the graduate of a local, accredited institution with 9.9 percent for whom it made no difference. Responses to question 11 were 1.1 percent choosing the graduate of a local, unaccredited institution, 85.7 percent selecting the applicant from a non-local, accredited institution, and 13.2 percent for whom it made no difference.

When asked to rank the importance of accreditation with respect to location and prestige of institutions in hiring, 80.7 percent listed accreditation

as most important, 15.9 percent as moderately important, and 3.4 percent as least important.

From the chi square analysis of questions involving accreditation (Appendixes E, F, G, and R), significance was found at the .95 confidence level for the importance of accreditation and hiring a graduate of an accredited institution (questions 3 and 13); the perceived prestige of the personnel officer's baccalaureate alma mater and hiring a graduate of an accredited institution (questions 4 and 12); the perceived prestige of the corporate president's doctoral alma mater and hiring a graduate of an accredited institution (questions 4 and 12); and the importance of accreditation and hiring a graduate of a local or accredited institution (questions 11 and 13).

Significance at the .99 level was found for the importance of accreditation and hiring a graduate of an accredited institution (questions 6 and 13); the importance of accreditation and hiring a graduate of a local, accredited institution (questions 10 and 13); and the importance of location and hiring a graduate of a local or accredited institution (questions 11 and 13) (Appendixes J, Q, and S).

Analysis of the questions involving accreditation suggested the rejection of the null hypothesis that no significant difference exists in employee selection based

on the accreditation of the baccalaureate degree granting institution of the applicant. Since analysis of the t test showed not only a significant number (92.3 percent) of respondents to prefer the candidate from the accredited institution in question 6, but also a significant number (81.6 percent) of employers who listed accreditation as the most important variable listed in question 13, rejection of hypothesis 1b was strongly considered.

Also, although initial investigation of question 3 appeared highly supportive of the rejection of the second null hypothesis, since 95.6 percent of the respondents favored the first ranking candidate from an accredited institution, it was difficult to distinguish between the influences of rank and accreditation. Question 4 made such clarification since 71.1 percent of the personnel officers showed preference for accreditation over rank by selecting the second ranking candidate from an accredited institution. Additional reason for hypothesis rejection was gathered from the very large portion (92.3 percent) of answers to question 6 which stated preference for a graduate of an accredited institution. Together questions 10 and 11 also formed support for the acceptance of accreditation as a factor in hiring. While in question 10, 90.1

percent selected the graduate of a local, accredited institution, question 11 allowed 85.7 percent of the respondents to differentiate between location and accreditation by choosing the candidate from a non-local, accredited institution. Strong support for the importance of institutional accreditation was evidenced by question 13 in which 80.7 percent of the personnel officers listed accreditation as most important, 15.9 percent as moderately important, and 3.4 percent as least important.

Chi square analysis of questions 6 and 13 also lent support for the rejection of the hypothesis. Significant differences between observed and expected frequencies were reported for the importance of accreditation and hiring a graduate of an accredited institution. This information was especially useful when it was recalled that 80.7 percent of the respondents considered accreditation as the most important of the three factors in question 13. Although not directly responsible for the rejection of the hypothesis since they involve either rank or location as variables in addition to accreditation, analysis of responses to question 13 with questions 3, 4, 10, and 11 was considered supportive of the role of accreditation. Although the analyses of other questions were

statistically significant, they had no direct bearing on the rejection of hypothesis 1b.

Hypothesis 1c

The third null hypothesis stated that no significant difference exists in employee selection based on relative location of the employer and institution. The t test analysis found the number of responses at the .95 level of confidence to answer C in question 7 to be significant. That meant that most, 63.7 percent, of the personnel officers felt location made no difference (Appendix C). That finding was in agreement with the lack of significance noted for the only 4.6 percent of the respondents who felt location was most important in question 13 (Appendix D).

The frequencies of question 7 through 11 and 13 dealt with institutional location (Appendix B). The graduate of a local institution was preferred 35.2 percent of the time in question 7 while the graduate of a non-local institution was chosen 1.1 percent. Most of the respondents (63.7 percent) felt location made no difference. In question 8, 75.8 percent of the personnel officers were more likely to hire the graduate of a local, prestigious institution. About a quarter, 24.2 percent felt location and prestige made no difference. A graduate of a local, non-prestigious

institution was selected in 22.2 percent of the cases in question 9, and 36.7 percent of the answers supported prestige over location by choosing the applicant of a non-local, prestigious institution. Accreditation and proximity were favored by 90.1 percent of the responses to question 10 while only 9.9 percent expressed no preference. The importance of location was subjugated to accreditation in question 11 since 85.7 percent of the personnel officers preferred an applicant from a non-local, accredited institution. Only 1.1 percent chose the candidate from a local, unaccredited institution, and 13.2 percent showed no preference. When asked to rank the importance of location with respect to accreditation and prestige, 4.6 percent felt it was most important, 36.8 percent moderately important, and 58.6 percent least important.

Chi square analysis (Appendixes L, M, N, and R) of expected and observed frequencies for responses dealing with location differed significantly at the .95 level for the importance of prestige and hiring a graduate of a local institution (questions 7 and 13); the importance of prestige and hiring a graduate of a local, prestigious institution (questions 8 and 13); the importance of accreditation and hiring a graduate of a local or prestigious institution (questions 9 and 13);

and the importance of accreditation and hiring a graduate of a local or accredited institution (questions 11 and 13).

Greater significance, at the .99 level, was observed for the importance of location and hiring a graduate of a local institution (questions 7 and 13); the importance of prestige and hiring a graduate of a local or prestigious institution (questions 9 and 13); the importance of location and hiring a graduate of a local or prestigious institution (questions 9 and 13); the importance of accreditation and hiring a graduate of a local, accredited institution (questions 10 and 13); and the importance of location and hiring a graduate of a local or accredited institution (questions 11 and 13) (Appendixes K, O, P, Q, and S).

On the basis of the questionnaire data, the hypothesis that no significant difference exists in employee selection based on relative location of the employer and institution was retained. The significance found by the range t test of the large number (63.7 percent) of respondents for whom location made no difference in question 7 and the lack of significance of responses to the relative importance of location in question 13 supported the retention of hypothesis 1c.

Also, the large number of responses (63.7 percent, 24.2 percent, and 41.1 percent) which indicated

no preference in questions 7, 8, and 9 suggested that location was not a major influence in hiring. Even those responses involving proximity in questions 8 and 10 which were large (75.8 percent and 90.1 percent) were likely to be due to the influences of the other factors, prestige and accreditation. This concept was supported by the responses to questions 9 and 11 in which prestige and accreditation were given priority over location. Question 13, in which the majority (58.6 percent) of the personnel officers listed location as the least important of the three factors, gave further reason for the retention of the null hypothesis.

Although eight chi square analyses involving location were found to be significant, they cannot be used to reject the null hypothesis since seven of the eight involve not only location but also other factors which may have been responsible for the statistical significance. Only the analysis of questions 7 and 13, the importance of location and hiring a graduate of a local institution, relied only on location as a variable. However, the question did not bear directly enough upon the hypothesis to promote its rejection. Therefore, since the data did not propose the rejection of hypothesis 1c, it was retained.

Hypothesis 2a

Hypothesis 2a stated that no significant difference exists between an employer (personnel officer or corporate president) from a prestigious alma mater and an employer from a non-prestigious alma mater in employee selection based on institutional prestige. From the sixty-six personnel officers listing baccalaureate alma maters, thirty-seven institutions were perceived as prestigious. Of the thirty-three personnel officers' masters degree alma maters, twenty-one were considered prestigious, and two of the five personnel officers' doctoral alma maters were perceived as prestigious. For corporate presidents, thirty-seven of the fifty-four baccalaureate alma maters were perceived as prestigious; twenty-one of the twenty-four masters degree alma maters were considered prestigious; and six of the seven doctoral alma maters were listed as prestigious (Appendix B).

Chi square analysis showed no statistical significance between the employer from prestigious or non-prestigious alma maters in question 12 and any of the questionnaire questions dealing with prestige. Therefore, hypothesis 2a was retained.

Hypothesis 2b

The fifth hypothesis stated that no significant difference exists between an employer (personnel officer or corporate president) from a prestigious alma mater and an employer from a non-prestigious alma mater in employee selection based on accreditation. As noted under hypothesis 2a, from the sixty-six personnel officers listing baccalaureate alma maters, thirty-seven institutions were perceived as prestigious. Of the thirty-three personnel officers' masters degree alma maters, twenty-one were considered prestigious, and two of the five personnel officers' doctoral alma maters were perceived as prestigious. For corporate presidents, thirty-seven of the fifty-four baccalaureate alma maters were perceived as prestigious; twenty-one of the twenty-four masters degree alma maters were considered prestigious; and six of the seven doctoral alma maters were listed as prestigious (Appendix B).

Chi square analysis revealed significant differences in expected and observed response frequencies at the .95 level of confidence for the perceived prestige of personnel officers' baccalaureate alma maters (question 12) and hiring a graduate of an accredited institution (question 4) and the perceived prestige of corporate presidents' doctoral alma maters (question 12),

and hiring a graduate of an accredited institution (question 4) (Appendixes F and G).

Although the chi square analysis of questions 4 and 12 initially suggested the rejection of null hypothesis 2b, it was likely that the significance found was the result of the compounding of variables since question 4 includes rank as a variable in addition to accreditation. The probability of such a situation was supported by the fact that no significance was found between question 12 and question 6 which deals purely with accreditation. Thus, hypothesis 2b was not rejected.

Hypothesis 2c

Hypothesis 2c stated that no significant difference exists between an employer (personnel officer or corporate president) from a prestigious alma mater and an employer from a non-prestigious alma mater in employee selection based on institutional location. As noted previously, from the sixty-six personnel officers listing baccalaureate alma maters, thirty-seven institutions were perceived as prestigious. Of the thirty-three personnel officers' masters degree alma maters, twenty-one were considered prestigious, and two of the five personnel officers' doctoral alma maters were perceived as prestigious. For corporate presidents, thirty-seven of the fifty-four baccalaureate alma maters

were perceived as prestigious; twenty-one of the twenty-four masters degree alma maters were considered prestigious; and six of the seven doctoral alma maters were listed as prestigious (Appendix B).

Chi square analysis showed no statistically significant difference between employers from prestigious or non-prestigious alma maters in question 12 and any of the questionnaire questions dealing with location. Therefore, hypothesis 2c was retained.

Summary of the Findings

After consideration of the data, institutional prestige, relative location, and the prestige of the employer's alma mater were retained as variables making no significant difference in employee selection, while institutional accreditation was discovered to be an influencing factor.

Chapter 4

SUMMARY OF THE FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The purpose of this study was to determine whether there is a significant difference in employee selection based on institutional reputation as determined by prestige and accreditation, relative location of employer and institution, and the alma mater of the corporate president and personnel officer.

A questionnaire was prepared to survey the effect of institutional reputation, location, and executive alma mater. It was distributed to the personnel officers of two hundred randomly selected companies listed in the College Placement Annual[1] as potential employers of baccalaureate graduates. The ninety-one questionnaires which were completed and returned were analyzed using a bivariate range t test, frequency distribution, and chi square analysis.

---

[1]College Placement Annual (Bethlehem, Pa.: The College Placement Council, Inc., 1978).

Summary of the Findings

Study of the data showed the following findings for each of the hypotheses listed.

Hypothesis 1a: No significant difference exists in employee selection based on the prestige of the baccalaureate degree granting institution of applicants. Hypothesis 1a was retained since institutional prestige was not found to be a major factor in hiring.

Hypothesis 1b: No significant difference exists in employee selection based on the accreditation status of the baccalaureate degree granting institution of applicants. Since the data strongly indicated that accreditation was influential in employee selection, hypothesis 1b was rejected.

Hypothesis 1c: No significant difference exists in employee selection based on relative location of the employer and institution. Location was not shown to be of major consequence in the hiring of employees. Therefore, hypothesis 1c was retained.

Hypothesis 2a: No significant difference exists between an employer (personnel officer or corporate president) from a prestigious alma mater and an employer from a non-prestigious alma mater in employee selection based on the prestige of the baccalaureate degree granting institution of applicants. Executive alma mater

was not shown to be significant in employee selection based on the prestige of the applicant's alma mater. Therefore, hypothesis 2a was retained.

Hypothesis 2b: No significant difference exists between an employer (personnel officer or corporate president) from a prestigious alma mater and an employer from a non-prestigious alma mater in employee selection based on the accreditation status of the baccalaureate degree granting institution of applicants. Conclusive evidence relating executive alma mater and the accreditation of candidate alma mater was not found, so hypothesis 2b was retained.

Hypothesis 2c: No significant difference exists between an employer (personnel officer or corporate president) from a prestigious alma mater and an employer from a non-prestigious alma mater in employee selection based on relative location of the employer and institution. The data failed to show any significant relationships between executive alma mater and the alma mater location of applicants, thus, causing the retention of hypothesis 2c.

Conclusions

Based on the findings of this study, the following conclusions may be made:

1. Institutional prestige was not a significant factor in employee selection. This is probably true because in the minds of employers, prestige is not necessarily indicative of quality education. Also, an institution's prestige may be due to non-academic factors such as athletics, history, graduates, or founders. Employers are likely more concerned with personal characteristics, achievement, and training than with institutional prestige.

2. Accreditation was found to be important in employee selection. This may be due to the fact that employers feel accreditation yields a degree of assurance of standard quality and subject matter presented, and some indication of student ability to learn and perform.

3. Proximity of school and employer was not a significant employee selection factor, quite likely because in working with a large firm where daily contact may be with individuals and locations throughout the nation, knowledge of the local community is not as important as it might be in working for a small, local enterprise. Similarly, organizations with constant contact outside the local area realize that local schools are not necessarily the only or best institutions providing quality job preparation.

4. The prestige of employer alma mater was not a significant factor in hiring based on the prestige of an

applicant's alma mater. This was because graduates of prestigious schools are not likely to be in awe of an institution for its name alone. They have seen from the inside that it was not the prestige of the institution which was of value to them, but that it was the elements of the educational process that provided quality training. Those elements could be present in an educational setting whether it was prestigious or not.

5. The prestige of an employer's alma mater was not a significant factor in the hiring of a job applicant based on the accreditation of his alma mater because employers graduating from prestigious and non-prestigious institutions both highly valued accreditation. Employers' educational backgrounds were less important than the increased probability of a reliable education provided by a candidate's graduation from an accredited institution.

6. The prestige of employer alma mater was not a significant factor in evaluating a job applicant based on the location of his alma mater because location is not primarily related to prestige since a prestigious institution could be either local or non-local depending upon the place of the employer.

Recommendations

Based on the conclusions drawn, the following recommendations have been made:

1. Since institutional prestige was not found to be a significant influence in the hiring of job applicants, a prospective employment candidate should select and graduate from an institution which best fulfills his personal and subject matter needs rather than choose an institution primarily for its general prestige.

2. Based on the conclusion that employers feel accreditation yields a degree of assurance of standard quality and subject matter presented, and student ability to learn and perform, a job applicant should plan to graduate from an accredited institution rather than from one which is unaccredited.

3. Since proximity of the employer and the alma mater of a prospective employee was not found in this study to be a major factor in hiring, an individual seeking employment with large national or international firms should select and graduate from an institution which best meets his personal and subject matter needs rather than select an institution primarily for its location.

4. For the second set of hypotheses, the prestige of the employer's alma mater was not found to be significantly influential in employee selection based on the prestige, accreditation, or location of an applicant's alma mater. Therefore, a job candidate should seek employment on the laurels of his job preparation, both personal and professional, rather than on the prestigious background of the employer.

Impressions of the Investigator

Upon conclusion of this research the author was aware of feelings which go beyond the data found. The results reported here differ from the general feelings of the author on the value of prestige as a factor in hiring decisions. Perhaps prestige was not recorded by the personnel officers as a significant variable because of the delicate and elusive nature or subconscious effect of prestige. The questionnaire was not designed to adequately reveal such reasoning. Also, although accreditation was found to be a significant factor in employee selection, the fact that most institutions which students consider attending are accredited provided very little additional information upon which students can select an institution.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Astin, Alexander W. Who Goes Where to College? Chicago: Science Research Associates, Inc., 1965.

Cartter, Allan M. An Assessment of Quality in Graduate Education. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1966.

College Placement Annual. Bethlehem, Pa.: The College Placement Council, Inc., 1978.

Harris, Sherry S., ed. 1976-77 Accredited Institutions of Postsecondary Education Programs Candidates, A Directory of Accredited Institutions, Professionally Accredited Programs, and Candidates for Accreditation. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1977.

Kappel, Frederick R. "From the World of College to the World of Work," Bell Telephone Magazine, 41 (Spring 1962), 3-15.

Kells, H. R. "The Reform of Regional Accreditation Agencies," Educational Record, 57, pp. 24-28.

Martin, Robert A. "The Inviolate, But Invalid, Employment Predictors," Personnel Journal, 47 (January 1968), 20-22.

McKinney, Reid Laurence. "A Study of the Relationship Between the Accreditation Status of Institutions and the Behavior of Their Products," Comprehensive Dissertation Index, 23(10), pp. 3731-3732.

Nicolson, Harold. The Meaning of Prestige. London: Cambridge University Press, 1937.

Orlans, Harold. Private Accreditation and Public Eligibility. Lexington, Mass.: D. C. Heath and Co., 1975.

The Report of the National Invitational Conference on Consumer Protection in Postsecondary Education. Denver: Education Commission of the States, No. 53, June 1974.

Vincent, William S., and Martin N. Olson. Measurement of School Quality and Its Determiners. Walden, N.Y.: Walden Printing Company, 1972.

Warner, W. Keith. "Accreditation and Other Forms of External Evaluation," Address and Proceedings. Oakland: Western College Association, 1973, pp. 48-58.

Warner, W. Keith. Accreditation Influences on Senior Institutions of Higher Education in the Western Accrediting Region: An Assessment. Oakland: Western College Association and the Senior Commission of the Western Association of Schools and Colleges, 1977.

Warner, Wesley E. "An Analysis of Hiring Criteria Used by Selected Employers in Evaluating Job Candidates," Dissertation Abstracts, 36, pp. 2679-2680A.

Young, Kenneth E. "COPA: A New Force on the National Scene," North Central Association Quarterly, 52(3) (Winter 1978), 359-362.

APPENDIXES

APPENDIX A

QUESTIONNAIRE

QUESTIONNAIRE

Part I: Assume that two bachelor degree applicants are interviewing for an open position within your firm. Let us assume that after you have reviewed the application forms you have ranked the candidates first and second. Given the following conditions please select the applicant you would most likely hire.

1.

Applicant A:	Applicant B:
was first on your ranking and graduated from a prestigious institution.	was second on your ranking and graduated from a non-prestigious institution.
CIRCLE YOUR CHOICE: A or B or C (makes no difference)	

2.

Applicant A:	Applicant B:
was first on your ranking and graduated from a non-prestigious institution.	was second on your ranking and graduated from a prestigious institution.
CIRCLE YOUR CHOICE: A or B or C (makes no difference)	

3.

Applicant A:	Applicant B:
was first on your ranking and graduated from an accredited institution.	was second on your ranking and graduated from an unaccredited institution.
CIRCLE YOUR CHOICE: A or B or C (makes no difference)	

4.

Applicant A:	Applicant B:
was first on your ranking and graduated from an unaccredited institution.	was second on your ranking and graduated from an accredited institution.
CIRCLE YOUR CHOICE: A or B or C (makes no difference)	

Part II: Assume that the qualifications of two bachelor degree applicants are the same except for the characteristics given below. Please select the applicant you would most likely hire.

5.

Applicant A:	Applicant B:
graduated from a prestigious institution.	graduated from a non-prestigious institution.
CIRCLE YOUR CHOICE: A or B or C (makes no difference)	

6.

Applicant A:	Applicant B:
graduated from an accredited institution.	graduated from an unaccredited institution.
CIRCLE YOUR CHOICE: A or B or C (makes no difference)	

7.

Applicant A:	Applicant B:
graduated from a local institution.	graduated from a non-local institution.
CIRCLE YOUR CHOICE: A or B or C (makes no difference)	

8. Applicant A: graduated from a local, prestigious institution. | Applicant B: graduated from a non-local, non-prestigious institution.

CIRCLE YOUR CHOICE: A or B or C (makes no difference)

9. Applicant A: graduated from a local, non-prestigious institution. | Applicant B: graduated from a non-local, prestigious institution.

CIRCLE YOUR CHOICE: A or B or C (makes no difference)

10. Applicant A: graduated from a local, accredited institution. | Applicant B: graduated from a non-local, unaccredited institution.

CIRCLE YOUR CHOICE: A or B or C (makes no difference)

11. Applicant A: graduated from a local, unaccredited institution. | Applicant B: graduated from a non-local, accredited institution.

CIRCLE YOUR CHOICE: A or B or C (makes no difference)

Part III:

12. On the grid below, please list the names of the institutions from which the personnel officer and the corporate president received their degrees. Also, please indicate, by checking the appropriate box, whether each institution is prestigious or non-prestigious.

DEGREES	NAME OF INSTITUTION	PRESTIGIOUS	NON-PRESTIGIOUS
Personnel Officer			
Bachelor's	_____		
Master's	_____		
Doctorate	_____		
Corporate President			
Bachelor's	_____		
Master's	_____		
Doctorate	_____		

13. Please match the following terms and numerals according to their importance to you in hiring an employee.

____ Institutional accreditation — 1. Most important

____ Institutional location — 2. Moderately important

____ Institutional prestige — 3. Least important

APPENDIX B

QUESTIONNAIRE WITH RESPONSE FREQUENCY NOTATIONS

QUESTIONNAIRE

Part I: Assume that two bachelor degree applicants are interviewing for an open position within your firm. Let us assume that after you have reviewed the application forms you have ranked the candidates first and second. Given the following conditions please select the applicant you would most likely hire.

1. Applicant A: was first on your ranking and graduated from a prestigious institution. Applicant B: was second on your ranking and graduated from a non-prestigious institution.

CIRCLE YOUR CHOICE: A or B or C (makes no difference)

Responses: A = 79 (86.8%), B = 0 (0%), C = 12 (13.2%)

2. Applicant A: was first on your ranking and graduated from a non-prestigious institution. Applicant B: was second on your ranking and graduated from a prestigious institution.

CIRCLE YOUR CHOICE: A or B or C (makes no difference)

Responses: A = 72 (80.0%), B = 3 (3.3%), C = 15 (16.7%)

3. Applicant A: was first on your ranking and graduated from an accredited institution. Applicant B: was second on your ranking and graduated from an unaccredited institution.

CIRCLE YOUR CHOICE: A or B or C (makes no difference)

Responses: A = 87 (95.6%), B = 0 (0%), C = 4 (4.4%)

4. Applicant A: was first on your ranking and graduated from an unaccredited institution. Applicant B: was second on your ranking and graduated from an accredited institution.

CIRCLE YOUR CHOICE: A or B or C (makes no difference)

Responses: A = 15 (16.7%), B = 64 (71.1%), C = 11 (12.2%)

Part II: Assume that the qualifications of two bachelor degree applicants are the same except for the characteristics given below. Please select the applicant you would most likely hire.

5. Applicant A: graduated from a prestigious institution. Applicant B: graduated from a non-prestigious institution.

CIRCLE YOUR CHOICE: A or B or C (makes no difference)

Responses: A = 53 (58.2%), B = 3 (3.3%), C = 35 (38.5%)

6. Applicant A: graduated from an accredited institution. Applicant B: graduated from an unaccredited institution.

CIRCLE YOUR CHOICE: A or B or C (makes no difference)

Responses: A = 84 (92.3%), B = 0 (0%), C = 7 (7.7%)

7. Applicant A: graduated from a local institution. Applicant B: graduated from a non-local institution.

CIRCLE YOUR CHOICE: A or B or C (makes no difference)

Responses: A = 32 (35.2%), B = 1 (1.1%), C = 58 (63.7%)

8. Applicant A: graduated from a local, prestigious institution. Applicant B: graduated from a non-local, non-prestigious institution.

CIRCLE YOUR CHOICE: A or B or C (makes no difference)

Responses: A = 69 (75.8%), B = 0 (0%), C = 22 (24.2%)

9. Applicant A: graduated from a local, non-prestigious institution. Applicant B: graduated from a non-local, prestigious institution.

CIRCLE YOUR CHOICE: A or B or C (makes no difference)

Responses: A = 20 (22.2%), B = 33 (36.7%), C = 37 (41.1%)

10. Applicant A: graduated from a local, accredited institution. Applicant B: graduated from a non-local, unaccredited institution.

CIRCLE YOUR CHOICE: A or B or C (makes no difference)

Responses: A = 82 (90.1%), B = 0 (0%), C = 9 (9.9%)

11. Applicant A: graduated from a local, unaccredited institution. Applicant B: graduated from a non-local, accredited institution.

CIRCLE YOUR CHOICE: A or B or C (makes no difference)

Responses: A = 1 (1.1%), B = 78 (85.7%), C = 12 (13.2%)

Part III:

12. On the grid below, please list the names of the institutions from which the personnel officer and the corporate president received their degrees. Also, please indicate, by checking the appropriate box, whether each institution is prestigious or non-prestigious.

DEGREES	NAME OF INSTITUTION	PRESTIGIOUS	NON-PRESTIGIOUS
Personnel Officer			
Bachelor's	_____	37	27
Master's	_____	21	10
Doctorate	_____	2	1
Corporate President			
Bachelor's	_____	37	16
Master's	_____	21	3
Doctorate	_____	6	1

13. Please match the following terms and numerals according to their importance to you in hiring an employee.

____ Institutional accreditation — 1. Most important

____ Institutional location — 2. Moderately important

____ Institutional prestige — 3. Least important

Responses:

Institutional accreditation:
1. Most important = 71 responses (80.7%)
2. Moderately important = 14 responses (15.9%)
3. Least important = 3 responses (3.4%)

Institutional Location:
1. Most important = 4 responses (4.6%)
2. Moderately important = 32 responses (36.8%)
3. Least important = 51 responses (58.6%)

Institutional Prestige:
1. Most important = 12 responses (13.8%)
2. Moderately important = 41 responses (47.1%)
3. Least important = 34 responses (39.9%)

APPENDIX C

QUESTIONNAIRE PART II: QUESTIONS 5, 6, AND 7 WITH t TEST CONFIDENCE INTERVAL AND PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSE NOTATIONS

Part II: Assume that the qualifications of two bachelor degree applicants are the same except for the characteristics given below. Please select the applicant you would most likely hire.

5. Applicant A: graduated from a prestigious institution. Applicant B: graduated from a non-prestigious institution.

CIRCLE YOUR CHOICE: A or B or C (makes no difference)

Responses:	A	B	C
Percentage of Responses	58.2%	3.3%	38.5%
*Confidence Intervals	47.3-69.1	0 - 7.6	27.8-49.2

6. Applicant A: graduated from an accredited institution. Applicant B: graduated from an unaccredited institution.

CIRCLE YOUR CHOICE: A or B or C (makes no difference)

Responses:	A	B	C
Percentage of Responses	92.3%	0%	7.7%
*Confidence Intervals	86.2-98.4	0- 0.5	1.6-13.8

7. Applicant A: graduated from a local institution. Applicant B: graduated from a non-local institution.

CIRCLE YOUR CHOICE: A or B or C (makes no difference)

Responses:	A	B	C
Percentage of Responses	35.2%	1.1%	63.7%
*Confidence Intervals	24.7-45.7	0- 3.8	53.1-74.3

*Tested at the .95 level

APPENDIX D

QUESTIONNAIRE PART III: QUESTION 13 WITH t TEST CONFIDENCE INTERVAL AND PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSE NOTATIONS

13. Please match the following terms and numerals according to their importance to you in hiring an employee.

____	Institutional accreditation	1. Most important
____	Institutional location	2. Moderately important
____	Institutional prestige	3. Least important

Responses:	Variables		
	Accreditation	Location	Prestige
Relative Importance			
Most Important			
Percentage of Responses	81.6%	4.6%	13.8%
*Confidence Intervals	72.7-90.5	0-9.7	5.8-21.8
Moderately Important			
Percentage of Responses	16.1%	36.8%	47.1%
*Confidence Intervals	7.7-24.5	25.9-47.7	35.8-58.4
Least Important			
Percentage of Responses	3.4%	58.0%	38.6%
*Confidence Intervals	0- 7.8	46.9-69.9	27.7-49.5

* Tested at the .95 level

APPENDIX E

CHI SQUARE ANALYSIS OF SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES IN OBSERVED AND EXPECTED RESPONSE FREQUENCIES DEALING WITH APPLICANT RANK AND ALMA MATER ACCREDITATION, AND RELATIVE IMPORTANCE OF INSTITUTIONAL ACCREDITATION FROM QUESTIONNAIRE QUESTIONS 3 AND 13

Relative Importance of Institutional Accreditation

	Most Important N	%	Moderately Important N	%	Least Important N	%	Total N	%
Applicant A: Ranked first, graduated from an accredited institution	69	82.1	13	15.5	2	2.4	84	100.0
Applicant B: Ranked second, graduated from an unaccredited institution	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Choice C: Makes no difference	2	15.0	1	25.0	1	25.0	4	100.0
Total	71	80.7	14	15.9	3	3.4	88	100.0

$x^2 = 6.44$ df = 2

Chi square values greater than 5.99 at the .95 level of confidence indicated significance.

APPENDIX F

CHI SQUARE ANALYSIS OF SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES IN OBSERVED AND EXPECTED RESPONSE FREQUENCIES DEALING WITH APPLICANT RANK AND ALMA MATER ACCREDITATION, AND PERCEIVED PRESTIGE OF PERSONNEL OFFICER BACCALAUREATE ALMA MATER FROM QUESTIONNAIRE QUESTIONS 4 AND 12

	Perceived Prestige of Personnel Officer Baccalaureate Alma Mater					
	Prestigious		Non-prestigious		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Applicant A: Ranked first, graduated from an unaccredited institution	7	63.6	4	36.4	11	100.0
Applicant B: Ranked second, graduated from an accredited institution	24	48.0	26	52.0	50	100.0
Choice C: Makes no difference	6	100.0	0	0.0	6	100.0
Total	37	55.2	30	44.8	67	100.0

$X^2 = 6.23$ df = 2

Chi square values greater than 5.99 at the .95 level of confidence indicated significance.

APPENDIX G

CHI SQUARE ANALYSIS OF SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES IN OBSERVED AND EXPECTED RESPONSE FREQUENCIES DEALING WITH APPLICANT RANK AND ALMA MATER ACCREDITATION, AND PERCEIVED PRESTIGE OF CORPORATE PRESIDENT DOCTORAL ALMA MATER FROM QUESTIONNAIRE QUESTIONS 4 AND 12

	Perceived Prestige of Corporate President's Doctoral Alma Mater					
	Prestigious		Non-prestigious		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Applicant A: Ranked first, graduated from an unaccredited institution	0	0.0	1	100.0	1	100.0
Applicant B: Ranked second, graduated from an accredited institution	5	100.0	0	0.0	5	100.0
Choice C: Makes no difference	1	100.0	0	0.0	1	100.0
Total	6	85.7	1	14.3	7	100.0

$X^2 = 7.00$ df = 2

Chi square values greater than 5.99 at the .95 level of confidence indicated significance.

APPENDIX H

CHI SQUARE ANALYSIS OF SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES IN OBSERVED AND EXPECTED RESPONSE FREQUENCIES DEALING WITH APPLICANT RANK AND ALMA MATER ACCREDITATION, AND RELATIVE IMPORTANCE OF INSTITUTIONAL ACCREDITATION FROM QUESTIONNAIRE QUESTIONS 4 AND 13

Relative Importance of Institutional Accreditation

	Most Important		Moderately Important		Least Important		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Applicant A: Ranked first, graduated from an unaccredited institution	2	13.3	10	66.7	3	20.0	15	100.0
Applicant B: Ranked second, graduated from an accredited institution	6	9.7	28	45.2	28	45.2	62	100.1
Choice C: Makes no difference	4	44.4	2	22.2	3	33.3	9	99.9
Total	12	14.0	40	46.5	34	39.5	86	100.0

$X^2 = 11.32$ df = 4

Chi square values greater than 9.49 at the .95 level of confidence indicated significance.

APPENDIX I

CHI SQUARE ANALYSIS OF SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES IN OBSERVED AND EXPECTED RESPONSE FREQUENCIES DEALING WITH APPLICANT ALMA MATER PRESTIGE AND RELATIVE IMPORTANCE OF INSTITUTIONAL PRESTIGE FROM QUESTIONNAIRE QUESTIONS 5 AND 13

	Relative Importance of Institutional Prestige							
	Most Important		Moderately Important		Least Important		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Applicant A: Graduated from a prestigious institution	12	23.5	27	52.9	12	23.5	51	99.9
Applicant B: Graduated from a non-prestigious institution	0	0.0	1	33.3	2	66.7	3	100.0
Choice C: Makes no difference	0	0.0	13	39.4	20	60.6	33	100.0
Total	12	13.8	41	47.1	34	39.1	87	100.0

$X^2 = 17.03$ df = 4

Chi square values greater than 13.3 at the .99 level of confidence indicated significance.

APPENDIX J

CHI SQUARE ANALYSIS OF SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES IN OBSERVED AND EXPECTED RESPONSE FREQUENCIES DEALING WITH APPLICANT ALMA MATER ACCREDITATION AND RELATIVE IMPORTANCE OF INSTITUTIONAL ACCREDITATION FROM QUESTIONS 6 AND 13

Relative Importance of Institutional Accreditation

	Most Important		Moderately Important		Least Important		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Applicant A: Graduated from an accredited institution	68	82.9	13	15.9	1	1.2	82	100.0
Applicant B: Graduated from an unaccredited institution	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Choice C: Makes no difference	3	50.0	1	16.7	2	33.3	6	100.0
Total	71	80.7	14	15.9	3	3.4	88	100.0

$X^2 = 17.67$ df = 2

Chi square values greater than 9.21 at the .99 level of confidence indicated significance.

APPENDIX K

CHI SQUARE ANALYSIS OF SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES IN OBSERVED AND EXPECTED RESPONSE FREQUENCIES DEALING WITH APPLICANT ALMA MATER LOCATION AND RELATIVE IMPORTANCE OF INSTITUTIONAL LOCATION FROM QUESTIONS 7 AND 13

	Relative Importance of Institutional Location							
	Most Important		Moderately Important		Least Important		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Applicant A: Graduated from a local institution	3	9.4	19	59.4	10	31.3	32	100.0
Applicant B: Graduated from a non-local institution	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	100.0	1	100.0
Choice C: Makes no difference	1	1.9	13	24.1	40	74.1	54	100.1
Total	4	4.6	32	36.8	51	58.6	87	100.0

$X^2 = 16.28$ df = 4

Chi square values greater than 13.3 at the .99 level of confidence indicated significance.

APPENDIX L

CHI SQUARE ANALYSIS OF SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES IN OBSERVED AND EXPECTED RESPONSE FREQUENCIES DEALING WITH APPLICANT ALMA MATER LOCATION AND RELATIVE IMPORTANCE OF INSTITUTIONAL PRESTIGE FROM QUESTIONS 7 AND 13

	Relative Importance of Institutional Prestige							
	Most Important		Moderately Important		Least Important		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Applicant A: Graduated from a local institution	5	15.6	8	25.0	19	59.4	32	100.0
Applicant B: Graduated from a non-local institution	0	0.0	1	100.0	0	0.0	1	100.0
Choice C: Makes no difference	7	13.0	32	59.3	15	27.8	54	100.1
Total	12	13.8	41	47.1	34	39.1	87	100.0

$X^2 = 11.38$ df = 4

Chi square values greater than 9.49 at the .95 level of confidence indicated significance.